Main Panel D covers the following sub-panels:

27 Area Studies
28 Modern Languages and Linguistics
29 English Language and Literature
30 History
31 Classics
32 Philosophy
33 Theology and Religious Studies
34 Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory
35 Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts
36 Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management

The following sections set out the criteria that Main Panel D and its sub-panels will apply in assessing submissions. These should be read alongside the guidance provided in REF 02.2011, ‘Assessment framework and guidance on submissions’ (hereafter ‘guidance on submissions’) and the generic statement of criteria and working methods provided in Part 1 of this document.

Section D1: Submissions and units of assessment
Section D2: Assessment criteria: outputs
Section D3: Assessment criteria: impact
Section D4: Assessment criteria: environment
Section D1: Submissions and units of assessment

Introduction
1. The main panel is charged with identifying excellence in the rich diversity of research covered by the units of assessment described below. It welcomes all outputs arising from this research, in whatever genre, medium or location, that can be demonstrated to meet the definition of research for the REF, as outlined in Annex C of ‘guidance on submissions’ and that have entered the public domain during the publication period. The sub-panels are committed to applying criteria and working methods that reflect the distinctive character, methodologies and full breadth of these disciplines (including interdisciplinary research), and that facilitate the formation of a balanced range of judgements, without privileging or disadvantaging any particular form of research output, research methodology or type of research environment.

2. The main panel and its sub-panels will operate according to the following principles:
   • panels will assess submissions in the form that HEIs have chosen to present their research, within the REF framework
   • panels will aim to identify excellence wherever they can find it.

Unit of assessment descriptors and boundaries

UOA 27: Area Studies

3. UOA 27 includes research across the spectrum of Area Studies, broadly defined to include the study of all regions of the world and the communities which are associated with or which inhabit them. The sub-panel takes an inclusive view of Area Studies, which we recognise to be a dynamic field, and the following list should be considered as indicative rather than exhaustive: African studies; American and Anglophone studies, including Canada and the United States, taken to include colonial North America; Asian studies, including Central Asian, North East Asian (including China), South Asian and South East Asian studies; Latin American and Caribbean studies; Australian, New Zealand and Pacific studies; European studies, including European Union studies and Russian and East European studies (including post-Soviet studies); Middle Eastern studies including Israel studies and Islamic world studies; and the interactions of these regions and peoples with the wider world, including African, Asian, Jewish, Muslim and other diasporas.

4. The sub-panel has expertise across the humanities and social sciences, and welcomes work from any disciplinary, interdisciplinary or theoretical perspective. It will assess submissions covering all aspects of the history, languages, cultures, literatures, religions, media, society, economics, human geography, politics and international relations of the above areas, as well as inter-regional and globalisation studies. The sub-panel is confident of its ability to assess a wide range of multi- and interdisciplinary work, but, given the broad scope of Area Studies, it recognises that submissions may be made in this UOA that include elements falling wholly or partially outside its members’ expertise. It is therefore mindful of the need to liaise with, and where appropriate to cross-refer parts of submissions to, other sub-panels in Main Panel C and Main Panel D, as well as appoint assessors (as set out in Part 1, paragraphs 92-100). Submissions may cover one of the areas listed or a combination of areas.

UOA 28: Modern Languages and Linguistics

5. The UOA includes research on the languages, literatures, cultures and societies of all regions, countries and communities where Celtic, Germanic, Romance or Slavonic languages or other languages of Europe and Latin America are, or were, used. This includes areas where European Languages have interacted with other cultures and Languages, for instance, Latin America. The UOA also includes all areas of general, historical, theoretical, descriptive and applied linguistics; phonetics and translation studies and interpreting studies; regardless of the methodology used or the language to which the studies are applied. The sub-panel will take a broad view of what constitutes modern language studies. This will include, but not be limited to: literature and thought; cultural studies; theatre studies; film and media studies; visual cultures; language studies; translation studies and interpreting studies; political, social and historical studies; postcolonial studies; gender studies; editorial scholarship, bibliography, textual criticism and theory and history of the book; philosophy and critical theory; comparative literature and literature in relation to the other arts; creative writing. The sub-panel welcomes the submission of interdisciplinary research, and will ensure that such work is assessed with appropriate expertise.

6. Submissions may legitimately include areas of research which fall within the descriptors of other UOAs. The sub-panel recognises that submissions made in the UOA may include elements falling wholly or partially outside the membership’s expertise and will apply the arrangements set out in Part 1, paragraph 92-100, where expertise needs to be
augmented. Submitting units whose research involves the study of these languages, societies, and cultures, but whose predominant focus is on a specific discipline in another UOA, are invited to submit their work in that UOA, or will be expected to be cross-referred when they will be more expertly assessed by other sub-panels.

**UOA 29: English Language and Literature**

7. The UOA includes: all aspects of language studies, including all areas of linguistics and of applied linguistics, with primary reference to any variety of English or Scots; the history of English or Scots; Old Norse/Icelandic (language, literature and linguistic studies); English literature from the early Middle Ages to the present day; North American literature; comparative literature; world literatures in English; colonial and postcolonial literatures and languages; women’s writing; creative writing; life writing; children’s literature; critical and cultural theory; cultural history; gender and sexuality studies; editorial scholarship, bibliography, textual criticism and theory, and history of the book; Irish literature in English; Scottish literature in English and Scots; Welsh literature in English; and applied, practice based, and pedagogical research in English.

8. The sub-panel will take a broad view of what constitutes English literature and language, and is aware that in some submitting units significant work will also be done in areas such as the following: theatre and performance studies; cultural studies; film, television and digital media studies; popular music; history; art history; philosophy; the linguistics of languages other than those mentioned above; translation studies. The sub-panel will apply the arrangements set out in Part 1, paragraphs 92-100, where its expertise needs to be augmented.

9. The sub-panel expects that interdisciplinary work will be submitted in this UOA which may include areas such as literature in relation to science and medicine, or creative technologies, and will ensure that such work is assessed with appropriate expertise.

**UOA 30: History**

10. The UOA includes all aspects of the study of the past except those specifically falling within the remit of other UOAs.

11. The sub-panel expects submissions in this UOA from all areas of history, including those listed below (in alphabetical order). This list is illustrative rather than exhaustive; it does not reflect any judgements about the relative significance of the subject areas, nor does it specify ‘fields’: business history; contemporary history; cultural history; economic history; environmental history; global history; heritage; historiography; history and memory; history of Britain, Ireland and Continental Europe (late Roman to the present); history of ideas; history of North America, South America, Africa, Asia and Australasia; history of science, technology and medicine; history of sexuality; imperial/colonial history; international history; labour history; local and regional history; material history; media history; military history; oral history; political history; public history; religious history; social history; theory of history; transnational history; urban history; women’s and gender history.

12. All ancient history will be automatically cross-referred to Sub-panel 31 (Classics); Byzantine history will also normally be cross-referred where it seems more appropriate for Sub-panel 31 to consider the output. The sub-panel may also cross-refer other submitted outputs as appropriate, for example to Sub-panel 27 (Area Studies).

13. The sub-panel welcomes the submission of interdisciplinary research, which may include areas such as history in relation to literature or art history. It expects to assess a significant proportion of such work but may cross-refer to other sub-panels where appropriate.

**UOA 31: Classics**

14. The UOA includes the language, literature, history, culture, art, archaeology and thought (including ancient science and philosophy) of Greece and Rome from the earliest times to late antiquity; Latin language and literature of the Middle Ages and subsequent periods; Ancient Egypt and the ancient Near East, Byzantine studies; modern Greek language, literature, history and culture; the classical tradition; and the reception of these periods and subjects.

15. Within the boundaries are the following: the Greek world from the Bronze Age to the fall of the Byzantine Empire; the Roman world from the Bronze Age to late antiquity; Greek lands, including the Diaspora, from the medieval period to the present; the philology and linguistics of Latin and Greek and of related and neighbouring languages; theory; comparative literature and such literature, literary theory, philosophy, political thought, material culture, art, film, performance, music, and such political, archaeological and other cultural activity as exploits in any way the history or cultural products of the Greek, Roman and Byzantine world; the pedagogy associated with learning and teaching in the subjects listed here.

16. The list above is illustrative rather than exhaustive. It does not reflect any judgements about the relative significance of the subject areas, nor does it specify ‘fields’.
17. UOA 31 spans boundaries with all the UOAs within Main Panel D and with Sub-panel 17 (Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology). The sub-panel will apply the arrangements set out in Part 1, paragraphs 92-100, where its expertise needs to be augmented.

**UOA 32: Philosophy**

18. The UOA includes all areas and styles of, and approaches to, philosophy. The sub-panel expects to receive submissions from all areas of philosophy, and considers the following subjects (listed alphabetically), among others, to be within the remit of the UOA: 19th and 20th century European philosophy including phenomenology, existentialism, critical theory, hermeneutics, and deconstruction; aesthetics; applied philosophy; epistemology; ethics, including applied ethics and meta-ethics; environmental philosophy; feminist philosophy; history of philosophy including ancient, medieval, modern and recent; logic; metaphysics; non-Western philosophy; philosophy of education; philosophy of language; philosophy of law; philosophy and history of mathematics; philosophy of mind; philosophy of religion; philosophy and history of science, technology and medicine; political and social philosophy; teaching philosophy; theories of collective and individual rationality. The areas mentioned are illustrative rather than exhaustive, and do not reflect any judgement about the relative significance of the subject areas.

19. Because philosophy engages with conceptual and foundational issues raised by other disciplines, it spans boundaries with a number of other UOAs, including but not limited to all the other UOAs within Main Panel D and the following UOAs within other main panels: UOA 2 (Public Health, Health Services and Primary Care), for example, medical ethics; UOA 4 (Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience), for example, cognitive science; UOA 10 (Mathematical Sciences), for example, mathematical logic; UOA 18 (Economics and Econometrics), for example, social choice theory and game theory; UOA 20 (Law), for example, jurisprudence; UOA 21 (Politics and International Studies), for example, political theory; UOA 23 (Sociology), for example, social theory.

20. The Philosophy sub-panel aims to be inclusive, and welcomes the submission of interdisciplinary outputs. As stated above, its remit covers all types of applied philosophy relating to practical issues both within and outside academia. The remit also covers work concerned with philosophical questions raised by other disciplines, for example work concerned with the foundations, methods, epistemic status, or interpretation of findings or theories in the other disciplines. The sub-panel may consider that work that merely references philosophical ideas without engaging with them philosophically will have its excellence best assessed by another sub-panel, and will consider cross-referral accordingly.

**UOA 33: Theology and Religious Studies**

21. The UOA encompasses all research in theology and religion, and is inclusive of all disciplinary approaches adopted in the field, including philosophical, theological, historical, philological, literary, phenomenological, psychological, sociological and anthropological methodologies. It encompasses the study and interpretation of religious institutions, movements, texts, laws, practices, ethics, beliefs, symbols, media, social relations, material objects, spaces and flows, both historical and contemporary. It includes all religious traditions, spiritualities and sacralised forms of commitment and their expression in different cultural media – for example, film, art, music and literature, in whatever genre or media. The study of varieties of secularism and secularity which reference religion explicitly or implicitly is also included. It also covers work concerned with theological and religious questions raised by other disciplines.

22. Theology and Religious Studies is an inherently multi- and cross-disciplinary subject, and religion intersects with many other aspects of society, politics, and culture. In recognition of this, the sub-panel will welcome submissions which overlap with the remit of other UOAs; or for which UOA 33 is not the only appropriate one; or from those undertaking relevant research in academic units not classified as theology, divinity or religious studies; or from academic units which specialise in only one area of the field.

23. Interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary work is welcome. Given the multi-disciplinary reach of UOA 33, it is anticipated that a substantial portion of submissions received will overlap with other UOAs, for example with Sub-panel 17 (Geography, Environmental Studies and Archaeology), Sub-panel 20 (Law), Sub-panel 21 (Politics and International Studies) and the sub-panels within Main Panel D. Sub-panel 33 contains considerable linguistic, methodological and cross-disciplinary expertise, but will apply the arrangements set out in Part 1, paragraphs 92-100, where expertise needs to be augmented. Sub-panel 33 continues to welcome innovative and cross-disciplinary approaches to the study of religion as well as more traditional methods.
UOA 34: Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory

24. The UOA includes research from all aspects of the history, theory and practice of art and design. The sub-panel will consider outputs, in whatever genre or medium, that meet the definition of research (as outlined in ‘guidance on submissions’, Annex C). The sub-panel acknowledges the diversity and range of related methods of academic study and artistic practice, and therefore adopts an inclusive definition of its remit.

25. Practice encompasses all disciplines within art and design, in which methods of making, representation, interrogation and interpretation are integral to their productions. History and Theory encompass the history, criticism, theory, historiography, pedagogy and aesthetics of architecture, art, craft, and design in their widest chronological and geographical framework. The UOA may also embrace fields such as anthropology, archaeology, cultural, social and gender studies, entrepreneurship, innovation, management and business studies, media studies, museology, and urban planning, where these relate to visual, material and spatial cultures. In a number of cases, the fields of work may be interdisciplinary, and thus have no firm or rigidly definable boundaries. For this reason the sub-panel expects to assess submissions that do not necessarily map onto institutional structures. The sub-panel is committed to applying criteria and working methods that are appropriate to all submitting units, whatever their size or structure, without privileging any particular form of research output or environment.

26. The following is an illustrative list of subject areas within practice, theory and history of art and design that the sub-panel expects to assess: animation; applied and decorative arts; architecture; conservation, the study of materials and techniques; crafts; creative and heritage industries; critical, historical, social and cultural studies; entrepreneurship and enterprise; film and broadcast media; fine arts; landscape and garden design; museology and curatorship; photography; policy, management and innovation studies; product design; spatial, two- and three-dimensional design; textile, dress and fashion; time-based and digital media; visual and material culture.

27. Sub-panels 34, 35 and 36 recognise that much research relating to a range of media platforms could readily meet the remit of any of them, and might sit in the wide boundaries that imprecisely separate the three areas of assessment responsibility. It will be the aim of these sub-panels to ensure that a decision to submit to any one of them should not advantage or disadvantage any research. This will be ensured by a common approach to assessment within the three sub-panels, and cross-referral between them where appropriate.

UOA 35: Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts

28. The sub-panel will assess research from all areas of music, drama, dance, theatre, performance, live art, film and television studies, and anticipates that outputs will span a range of writings, edited publications and research-led creative practices, as well as artefacts and curatorial outputs. The sub-panel expects to evaluate research that encompasses analytical, applied, ethnographical, historical, pedagogical, practice-led, scientific, technological and theoretical approaches to the widest domains of dance, drama, music, performing and screen arts, and covers the broadest understanding of the subject disciplines within any cultural, geographical or historical context.

29. Sub-panels 34, 35 and 36 recognise that much research relating to a range of media platforms could readily meet the remit of any of them, and might sit in the wide boundaries that imprecisely separate the three areas of assessment responsibility. It will be the aim of these sub-panels to ensure that a decision to submit to any one of them should not advantage or disadvantage any research. This will be ensured by a common approach to assessment within the three sub-panels, and cross-referral between them where appropriate.

30. Sub-panel 35 predicts further overlaps with other UOAs, including those in Main Panels A and C, as well as Sub-panel 9 (Physics); Sub-panel 11 (Computer Science and Informatics) and Sub-panel 13 (Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Metallurgy and Materials), Sub-panel 28 (Modern Languages and Linguistics) and Sub-Panel 29 (English Language and Literature), and a degree of cross-referral may take place as appropriate.

31. The sub-panel expects to appoint assessors in areas where it anticipates a high number of outputs (as with composition) or where it would benefit from further areas of expertise.

UOA 36: Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management

32. The sub-panel recognises the rich diversity of research in communication, cultural and media studies, library and information management, and welcomes all outputs arising from this research, in whatever genre or medium, that can be demonstrated to meet the definition of research for
the REF (as outlined in ‘guidance on submissions’, Annex C). In setting out its remit, the sub-panel recognises that the UOA descriptor covers two broad fields of research which are often distinct both organisationally and academically, and welcomes submissions that reflect this. It also recognises that the activities covered by its remit, even within its two broad fields of coverage, are often rooted in quite distinct research traditions or infrastructures. It will assess research on its merits, with no penalty for research which is plainly within a distinct tradition within the sub-panel’s remit. It will nonetheless welcome research which seeks to engage with questions and concerns, such as the ‘information society’, heritage (both cultural and museum aspects), networks or convergence, which may transcend field boundaries.

33. The UOA includes research that addresses or deploys theory, history, institutional, policy, textual, critical and/or empirical analysis, or practice within communication, culture, media, journalism and film studies. Within UK higher education much, but not all, of this work is likely to emanate from units or departments in communication studies, cultural studies, media studies, journalism, or film and television studies. This work will include research on print media, broadcasting and the moving image, and will include computer-mediated communication, popular culture, and diverse information and communication technologies, which will be variably titled and organised. Much will also be conducted in units or departments situated elsewhere within the social sciences, arts or humanities. The sub-panel will assess research as defined above which addresses (but is not confined to): policy for regulation of culture and the media; the organisation, institutions, political economy and practice of cultural production; media and cultural texts, forms and practices; and media and cultural audiences, consumption and reception, including questions of power, identity and difference.

34. The UOA also includes research concerned with the management of information and knowledge in all formats, namely librarianship and information science, archives and records management, and information systems. This may include: research on the generation, dissemination and publication, exploitation and evaluation of information and knowledge; information policy; information media; information literacy; systems thinking; systems development; knowledge management systems; information retrieval; preservation and conservation; impact assessment; digital humanities; and historical and cultural aspects of the disciplines.

35. The sub-panel will adopt an inclusive approach, and considers that it has the expertise to assess work in all of the areas covered by the UOA descriptor. Where research is at the boundaries of the UOA, submitting units are encouraged to submit their strongest work irrespective of the form of output or the extent of its interdisciplinary nature.

36. Sub-panels 34, 35 and 36 recognise that much research relating to a range of media platforms could readily meet the remit of any of them, and might sit in the wide boundaries that imprecisely separate the three areas of assessment responsibility. It will be the aim of these sub-panels to ensure that a decision to submit to any one of them should not advantage or disadvantage any research. This will be ensured by a common approach to assessment within the three sub-panels, and cross-referral between them where appropriate.

37. The sub-panel also anticipates likely overlap of areas within its remit with the concerns of other sub-panels both within Main Panel D and without, including for example Sub-panel 11 (Computer Science and Informatics), Sub-panel 19 (Business and Management Studies) and other social sciences panels. The sub-panel will apply the arrangements set out in Part 1, paragraphs 92-100, where its expertise needs to be augmented.

**Interdisciplinary research and work on the boundaries between UOAs**

38. The main panel recognises that the UOAs described above do not have firm or rigidly definable boundaries, and that aspects of research are naturally interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary or span the boundaries between individual UOAs, whether within the main panel or across main panels.

39. The arrangements for assessing interdisciplinary research and submissions that span UOA boundaries – including through the appointment of assessors and, where necessary, cross-referring specific parts of submissions between sub-panels – are common across all main panels and are described in Part 1, paragraphs 92-100.

40. In addition, Main Panel D recognises that there are research areas which may be undertaken in a range of different contexts, and some of these therefore occur in the descriptors of a number of UOAs. These areas include but are not limited to: applied linguistics, critical theory, cultural history, digital cultural heritage, digital humanities, film studies, gender studies, history of science and technology, television studies and museology. The main panel takes the view that institutions active in such areas are free to submit their research in the way that represents the activity most effectively. Panels’ working methods will accommodate such instances.
Pedagogic research

41. Research on pedagogy and educational issues within higher education that relate to the disciplines covered by Main Panel D may be submitted in the UOA to which it relates or in UOA 25 (Education), as deemed appropriate by submitting HEIs. Main Panel D anticipates that individual sub-panels will assess such research where it relates to higher education in the sub-panel’s discipline area.

42. Research into teaching in other education sectors or general educational issues should be submitted in UOA 25, or will be cross-referred to Sub-panel 25 as appropriate.

Multiple submissions

43. ‘Guidance on submissions’ (paragraphs 50-52) sets out the arrangements whereby institutions may exceptionally, and only with prior permission of the REF manager, make more than one submission (multiple submissions) in the same UOA. These exceptions include situations where a sub-panel considers there is a case for multiple submissions in its UOA, given the nature of the disciplines covered.

44. The following sub-panels in Main Panel D consider that there is a case, based on the nature of the disciplines covered by their UOAs, for multiple submissions in these UOAs and would expect to receive requests:

- Sub-panel 27 (Area Studies)
- Sub-panel 28 (Modern Languages and Linguistics)
- Sub-panel 34 (Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory)
- Sub-panel 35 (Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts)
- Sub-panel 36 (Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management)

45. Requests for multiple submissions may be made in other UOAs within Main Panel D but are expected to be a rare occurrence. All such requests will be considered according to the criteria and procedures at paragraph 50 of ‘guidance on submissions’.

46. When single submissions contain clearly identifiable distinct organisational units or areas of research, in accordance with ‘guidance on submissions’ (paragraph 52) and where sub-panels consider it appropriate, sub-panels will provide feedback to the head of institution relating to those distinct units or areas of research.
Section D2: Assessment criteria: outputs

Output types

47. The main panel welcomes all forms of research output that fulfil the eligibility criteria for the REF (set out in paragraphs 105-117 of ‘guidance on submissions’ and in Part 1, paragraphs 43-44 of this document.)

48. The sub-panels will neither advantage nor disadvantage any type of research or form of output, whether it is physical or virtual, textual or non-textual, visual or sonic, static or dynamic, digital or analogue.

49. Outputs that embody research may include, but are not limited to (in no particular order):
   - books (authored or edited)
   - chapters in books
   - journal articles
   - working papers
   - published conference papers
   - electronic resources and publications
   - exhibition or museum catalogues
   - translations; scholarly editions
   - creative writing and compositions
   - curatorship and conservation
   - databases
   - grammars
   - dictionaries
   - digital and broadcast media
   - performances and other types of live presentation
   - artefacts
   - designs and exhibitions
   - films, videos and other types of media presentation
   - software design and development
   - advisory report
   - the creation of archival or specialist collections to support the research infrastructure.

50. Sub panels expect to receive anthologies, edited books and curatorial projects where the researcher has made a demonstrable contribution to the research published (in addition to any article published in the same work). Where such a research contribution is part or all of the output to be assessed, the whole work (anthology, edited book or curatorial project) should be submitted. Submitting units may provide a statement (of up to 100 words) to clarify the nature of the individual’s research contribution.

51. Substantial dictionary or encyclopaedia entries and groups of short items including groups of entries (where such work embodies research as defined for the purposes of the REF in ‘guidance on submissions’) may be submitted as a single output, along with an explanation of the rationale for grouping the such items (maximum 100 words).

52. In accepting the widest range and types of research output, the sub-panels will employ assessment methodologies appropriate to all of these outputs and judge them entirely on research quality.

53. No output will be privileged or disadvantaged on the basis of the publisher, where it is published or the medium of its publication.

Outputs with significant material in common

54. The sub-panels recognise that there may be cases where two or more research outputs listed against an individual in a submission include significant material in common. The sub-panels will use their professional judgment in assessing these outputs such that they will assess each output taking account of the common material only once. In circumstances where the overlapping material is excessive, this could result in one of the outputs being graded as ‘unclassified’, so that the other can be assessed in full.

55. Where a submitted output includes significant material in common with an output published prior to 1 January 2008, as stated in Part 1, paragraph 44, submissions should explain how far the earlier work was revised to incorporate new material (maximum 100 words).

Co-authored/co-produced outputs

56. The sub-panels welcome the submission of co-authored or co-produced outputs, and will judge the output on its research quality regardless of the number of contributors.

57. Where a co-authored or co-produced output is submitted for assessment, it must be listed against an individual member of staff who made a substantial research contribution to the output. Information may be requested through an audit to verify this, and where it cannot be verified the output will be graded as ‘unclassified’.

58. With the exception of the arrangements for the submission of a co-authored output twice in the same submission, detailed at paragraph 61, the sub-panels do not require the submission of textual information...
about the individual co-author’s contribution to a co-authored output and, if received, will take no account of such statements.

59. Once the sub-panel accepts that the author has made a substantial research contribution to the output, the sub-panel will assess the quality of the output taking no further regard of the member of staff’s individual contribution. The quality of each output will be judged on its merits independent of authorship arrangements.

**Listing a co-authored output multiple times within the same submission**

60. Where two or more co-authors of an output are returned in different submissions (whether from the same HEI or different HEIs), any or all co-author(s) that made a substantial research contribution to the output may list the same output.

61. Institutions may list a co-authored output against up to two members of staff returned within the same submission. In such cases, the panel requires the submitting institution to provide a brief statement (up to 100 words) explaining the substantial and distinctive contribution of each of the submitting authors.

62. Once the sub-panel has determined that each co-author made a substantial contribution to the output, it will assess the quality of the output as a whole, taking no further regard of each individual co-author’s contribution. If a sub-panel does not accept the justification for listing the output twice, one occurrence of the output will be graded as ‘unclassified’.

**Double-weighted outputs**

63. The sub-panels recognise that there will be cases where the scale and/or scope of a research output required a research effort equivalent to that required to produce two or more single outputs and that may, in some cases, have limited the ability of an individual researcher to produce four substantial outputs within the assessment period. The sub-panels want to recognise and double-weight such outputs in the assessment; in other words for them to count as two outputs both in a submission and in the calculation of the outputs sub-profile.

64. The sub-panels have identified the following characteristics which might apply to the research effort associated with a double-weighted output:

- The generation of a particularly extensive or complex concept or thesis.
- The collection and analysis of a considerable body of material.
- The use of primary sources which were especially extensive, complex or difficult to access.
- The presentation of a critical insight or argument which was dependent upon the completion of a lengthy period of data collection.
- The production of a research output which was contingent upon the completion of particularly complex and extensive period of workshop/studio practice.

65. Institutions should request that an output is treated as double-weighted by submitting a supporting statement to justify the claim, explaining in what ways the output embodies the characteristics described in paragraph 64, or embodies other, similar, characteristics (maximum 100 words).

66. Sub-panels will assess the claim for double-weighting separately from assessing the quality of the output, and there is no presumption that double-weighted outputs will be assessed at higher quality grades. When assessing claims for double-weighting, the sub-panel will not privilege or disadvantage any particular form of research or type of output.

67. No more than two outputs listed against an individual may be requested for double-weighting. Co-authored outputs may in principle be identified as double-weighted by one or more of their authors, bearing in mind that the double-weighting claim should apply to the effort of the individual submitting author. However, requests for double-weighting may not be made for co-authored outputs that have been listed twice in a single submission (as set out in paragraph 61).

68. Given the publication practices in Main Panel D disciplines, and in view of the main panel’s wish to give full recognition to outputs of extended scale and scope, institutions may (but are not required to) include a reserve output for each double-weighting request. The reserve output will be assessed only if the sub-panel does not accept the request for double-weighting. If no reserve output is included and the request for double-weighting is not accepted by the sub-panel, then the ‘missing’ output will be graded as ‘unclassified’.

69. As the number of outputs submitted for assessment cannot sum to more than four per staff member submitted, no more than two outputs listed against an individual may be requested for double-weighting. In other words, the maximum number of outputs listed against a member of staff will comprise one of the following:

- four single outputs
- two single outputs plus one double-weighted output, plus the option to include one further output identified as a reserve
- two double-weighted outputs plus the option to include a reserve output for each.

70. Given that sub-panels will assess submissions in the form that HEIs have chosen to present their research within the REF, they will double-weight outputs only where requested by the submitting institution (and the request is accepted by the sub-panel), and will not double-weight any output for which a request has not been made by the institution.

**Submission of outputs**

71. In order to form an expert judgment on the quality of each research output, sub-panel members will examine such evidence as needed. Where the research content of the output may not be self-evident, submitting units should supply additional information as specified in b below. A ‘portfolio’, as specified in c below, should only be included where the research output and ‘information about the research process and/or content’, together, do not provide material sufficient to assess the output. Institutions should, therefore, submit only such evidence as they deem necessary to enable sub-panel members to properly assess a research output, within the following guidelines:

a. **Research output:** This should be submitted without additional material where the output is in itself deemed to constitute sufficient evidence of the research.

b. **Information about the research process and/or content:** Submitting units may include a statement of up to 300 words in cases where the research imperatives and research process of an output (such as an artefact, curation, database, digital format, installation, composition, performance or event, screening, tape, creative writing, database, textbook, translation or video) might further be made evident by descriptive and contextualising information. Where the location or medium of the output is essential to a proper understanding of the research being presented this should be explained in the 300 words. The sub-panels will ignore any additional material that includes evaluative commentary on the perceived quality of a research output.

c. **Portfolio:** In cases where the research output is: ephemeral (for example, time-based, non-material, or no longer available); is one in a series of interconnected works (for example, performances or installations); or cannot fully represent its research dimensions through the evidence provided in a and b above, a portfolio in either digital or physical form may be submitted. This material must be sufficiently substantial to constitute evidence which will allow sub-panel members to access the research dimensions of the work. The expectation is that a portfolio is likely to include complementary evidence about the processes and outcomes of the work, for example DVDs, tapes (video and audio), photographs, sketchbooks, web-sites, catalogues, interviews or programme notes. The material should be presented with the sole purpose of assisting panel members to access fully the research dimensions of the work.

**Additional information on outputs**

72. For research outputs in languages other than English (‘guidance on submissions’, paragraphs 128-130), a short abstract in English should be provided to describe the content and nature of the work. This abstract does not form part of the assessment of the submitted output. This requirement is waived for outputs submitted in UOA 28 (Modern Languages and Linguistics) if the output is produced in any of the languages within the remit of that UOA: that is, all Celtic, Slavonic, Germanic and Romance languages.

73. A summary of all the additional information about outputs required by Main Panel D is at Annex A.

**Citation data and bibliographic indicators**

74. The sub-panels within Main Panel D will neither receive nor make use of any citation or bibliometric data to inform their judgements.

75. In assessing the quality of outputs, the sub-panels in Main Panel D will not privilege any journal or conference rankings/lists, the perceived standing of the publisher or the medium of publication, or where the research output is published. Where, however, the site-specific location of a research output is essential to an understanding of the research, this information should be presented as detailed in paragraph 71b.

**Criteria and level definitions**

76. This section provides a descriptive account of how the sub-panels will interpret the generic criteria for assessing outputs – originality, significance and rigour – and will apply them at each of the starred quality levels. This descriptive account expands on and complements the generic criteria and definitions in Annex A of ‘guidance on submissions’, but does not replace them.

**Interpretation of generic criteria**

77. When assessing the quality of outputs, the sub-panels will apply the same criteria to all outputs regardless of their form. In so doing they will seek to identify the highest quality research wherever it exists, with four star being a realistic and attainable quality level in all components of the assessment.
78. The criteria for assessing outputs will be interpreted as follows:

- **Originality**: a creative/intellectual advance that makes an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge. This may include substantive empirical findings, new arguments, interpretations or insights, imaginative scope, assembling of information in an innovative way, development of new theoretical frameworks and conceptual models, innovative methodologies and/or new forms of expression.

- **Significance**: the enhancement or deserved enhancement of knowledge, thinking, understanding and/or practice.

- **Rigour**: intellectual coherence, methodological precision and analytical power; accuracy and depth of scholarship; awareness of and appropriate engagement with other relevant work.

**Interpretation of generic level definitions**

79. The terms ‘world-leading’, ‘international’ and ‘national’ will be taken as quality benchmarks within the generic definitions of the quality levels. They will relate to the actual, likely or deserved influence of the work. There will be no assumption of any necessary international exposure in terms of publication or reception, or any necessary research content in terms of topic or approach. Nor will there be an assumption that work published in a language other than English or Welsh is necessarily of a quality that is internationally benchmarked.

80. In assessing outputs, the sub-panels will look for evidence of originality, significance and rigour and apply the generic definitions of the starred quality levels as follows:

a. In assessing work as being **four star** (quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:
   - a primary or essential point of reference
   - of profound influence
   - instrumental in developing new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences
   - a major expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application
   - outstandingly novel, innovative and/or creative.

b. In assessing work as being **three star** (quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:
   - an important point of reference
   - of lasting influence
   - a catalyst for, or important contribution to, new thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences
   - a significant expansion of the range and the depth of research and its application
   - significantly novel or innovative or creative.

c. In assessing work as being **two star** (quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of, or potential for, some of the following types of characteristics across and possibly beyond its area/field:
   - a recognised point of reference
   - of some influence
   - an incremental and cumulative advance on thinking, practices, paradigms, policies or audiences
   - a useful contribution to the range or depth of research and its application.

d. In assessing work as being **one star** (quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour), sub-panels will expect to see evidence of the following characteristics within its area/field:
   - based on existing traditions of thinking, methodology and/or creative practice
   - a useful contribution of minor influence.

e. A research output will be graded **‘unclassified’** if it is either:
   - below the quality threshold for one star; or
   - does not meet the definition of research used for the REF.

---

88 REF 01.2012
Section D3: Assessment criteria: impact

Introduction

81. This section should be read alongside ‘guidance on submissions’ (in particular, Section 3, Annex A, Annex C and Annex G), which sets out the generic definition of impact for the REF, the requirements for submitting impact case studies and a completed impact template, the associated eligibility guidelines, and the generic assessment criteria and level definitions. The sub-panels will assess impact in accordance with this framework.

82. This section provides information which adds to and complements, but does not replace, ‘guidance on submissions’ with the intention of assisting institutions in developing their submissions for this new element of research assessment.

83. Research across the arts and humanities (understood in their broadest definition) has consequences for individuals and groups in the UK and internationally, challenging imaginations and enriching lives economically, culturally, spiritually and educationally. The impact of such research is powerful, pervasive and ubiquitous, influencing civil society and the quality of life. Impact may be the result of individual or collective research (or a combination of these), including collaboration with researchers beyond the UK. The impact of research may be foreseen or unforeseen. It can emerge as an end product, but can also be demonstrated during the research process. Impact takes place through a wide variety of mechanisms. The links between research and its consequences may be direct and causal, or diffuse and non-linear. It may effect change or enrichment for local, national or international communities, groups or individuals. Consequently public engagement may be an important feature of many case studies, typically as the mechanism by which the impact claimed has been achieved. The sub-panels will take all these factors into account as appropriate when weighing the evidence provided.

Range of impacts

84. Table D1 is intended to illustrate some of the wide variety of areas in which impact from research across Main Panel D may be found to have a positive influence on the quality of life of individuals and communities locally, nationally and internationally. These are indicative only, and in practice much of the impact will cross boundaries between them or go beyond them. Case studies are not expected to be classified in this way by submitting units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table D1</th>
<th>Indicative range of impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Informing and influencing the form and content of associations between people or groups to illuminate and challenge cultural values and social assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural life</td>
<td>Creating and interpreting cultural capital in all of its forms to enrich and expand the lives, imaginations and sensibilities of individuals and groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic prosperity</td>
<td>Applying and transferring the insights and knowledge gained from research to create wealth in the manufacturing, service, creative and cultural sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Informing and influencing the form or the content of the education of any age group in any part of the world where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy making</td>
<td>Informing and influencing policy debate and practice through interventions relating to any aspect of human or animal well-being or the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public discourse</td>
<td>Extending the range and improving the quality of evidence, argument and expression to enhance public understanding of the major issues and challenges faced by individuals and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>Contributing to the development and delivery of public services or legislation to support the welfare, education, understanding or empowerment of diverse individuals and groups in society, including the disadvantaged or marginalised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
85. **Examples of impact.** The following list offers submitting institutions some examples of impact that derive from research across the broad range of subjects covered by arts and humanities (and beyond). It is provided to stimulate ideas about the kinds of impact that could be developed into case studies where they meet the definition of impact set out in Annex C of ‘guidance on submissions’. The examples below are indicative only and do not articulate the expectations of any one sub-panel:

- Generating new ways of thinking that influence creative practice.
- Creating, inspiring and supporting new forms of artistic, literary, linguistic, social, economic, religious, and other expression.
- Contributing to innovation and entrepreneurial activity through the design and delivery of new products or services.
- Contributing to economic prosperity via the creative sector including publishing, music, theatre, museums and galleries, film and television, fashion, tourism, and computer games.
- Informing or influencing practice or policy as a result of research on the nature and extent of religious, sexual, ethnic or linguistic discrimination.
- Research into the languages and cultures of minority linguistic, ethnic, religious, immigrant, cultures and communities used by government, NGOs, charities or private sector to understand and respond to their needs.
- Helping professionals and organisations adapt to changing cultural values.
- Contributing to continuing personal and professional development.
- Preserving, conserving, and presenting cultural heritage.
- Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of the tourist experience.
- Influencing the design and delivery of curriculum and syllabi in schools, other HEIs or other educational institutions where the impact extends significantly beyond the submitting HEI, for example through the widespread use of text books, primary sources or an IT resource in education.
- Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation.
- Contributing to a wider public understanding of basic standards of wellbeing and human rights conceptions.
- Informing or influencing the development of expert systems in areas such as medicine, human resources, accounting, and financial services.
- Influencing the methods, ideas or ethics of any profession.
- Providing expert advice to governments, NGOs, charities and the private sector in the UK and internationally, and thereby influencing policy and/or practice.
- Engaging with and mediating between NGOs and charities in the UK and internationally to influence their activities, for example in relation to health, education and the environment.
- Contributing to widening public access to and participation in the political process.

86. HEIs are reminded that impacts on research or the advancement of academic knowledge within the higher education sector (whether in the UK or internationally) are excluded. Other impacts within the HE sector that meet the definition of impact for the REF are included where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI. (See ‘guidance on submissions’, Annex C.)

**Case studies: evidence of impact**

87. An impact case study for the purposes of the REF is necessarily a written submission (see ‘guidance on submissions’, paragraph 147b and Annex G). The sub-panels see the narratives in the case studies as a crucial part of the text; they will link the underpinning research to the impact or benefit claimed, and they will be the main contextualisation in each case study for the types of evidence of impact provided.

88. It is fully accepted that not all potential evidence might be available to submitting institutions. The integrity, coherence and clarity of the narrative accompanying each case study will be essential to the panels when forming their judgements, and key claims made in the narrative should be capable of corroboration.

89. The main panel recognises that some of the evidence in case studies may be of a confidential or sensitive nature. The arrangements for submitting and assessing case studies that include such material are set out in Part 1, paragraphs 58-59.

90. While it is expected that narratives will differ according to the nature of the impact claimed, case studies should clearly articulate the relationship between the underpinning research and the impact. This is likely to be evident in the nature and extent of external engagement and dissemination, as well as in the types of individuals, groups or organisations.
engaged with. Case studies then have to demonstrate the reach and significance of the impact itself. This is typically evident in the outcomes of that process of engagement and dissemination. Evidence of dissemination on its own will not be sufficient.

91. Evidence for the relationship between the underpinning research and the impact claimed and evidence for the impact itself may include but not be limited to items in the following indicative list:

**Table D2  Examples of evidence of impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative indicators</th>
<th>• Publication and sales figures both in the UK and overseas, audience or attendance figures (including demographic data where relevant), broadcasting data and other forms of media, download figures, or database and web-site hits over a sustained period.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding from public or other charitable bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of use of education materials arising from the research (where they extend significantly beyond the submitting HEI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism data, including audience figures and visitor numbers at exhibitions, events, performances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Growth of small businesses in the creative industries. Generation of new products. Sales figures and income generated. Employment data (for example, evidence of jobs created).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiques or citations in users’ documents</td>
<td>• Citations in reviews outside academic literature. Independent citations in the media, including in online documents. Reviews, blogs and postings. Programme, exhibition or catalogue notes. Prizes. Translations. Recorded feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion in teaching materials or teaching bibliographies. Replication of work in structure of courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of uptake of research in documents produced by public or commercial bodies; citations in policy documents and reviews, or other published reports on policy debates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement</td>
<td>• Information about the number and profile of people engaged and types of audience. Follow-up activities or media coverage. Evidence of sales, downloads of linked resources or access to web content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Descriptions of the social, cultural or other significance of the research insights with which the public have engaged. Evaluation data. User feedback or testimony. Critical external reviews of the engagement activity. Evidence of third party involvement, for example how collaborators have modified their practices, contributions (financial or in-kind) by third parties to enhance services or support for the public, or evidence of funds from third parties to enhance or extend the engagement activity. Evidence of sustainability, through, for example, a sustained or ongoing engagement with a group, a significant increase in participation in events or programmes, continuing sales, downloads, or use of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy engagements</td>
<td>• Evidence of influence on a debate in public policy and practice through membership of or distinctive contributions to expert panels and policy committees or advice to government (at local, national or international level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal partnership agreements or research collaboration with major institutions, NGOs and public bodies. Consultancies to public or other bodies that utilise research expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of engagement with campaign and pressure groups and other civil organisations (including membership and activities of those organisations and campaigns) as a result of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Changes to professional standards and behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent testimony</td>
<td>• Acknowledgements in annual reports or other publications of NGOs, charities and other civil society organisations. Testimony of experts or users who can attest to the reach and/or significance of impact. Third-party evidence of changed policies, practices, processes, strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal evaluations</td>
<td>• Professional evaluations of exhibitions, performances or other outputs. Formal peer reviews of funded impact-relevant research. Studies on the social return on investment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
92. The sub-panels recommend that institutions refer to the following list of characteristics when preparing case studies:

- All the material required to make a judgement should be included – no further reading should be required.
- There should be a clear definition of the beneficiaries, or what had changed as a result of the research.
- The narrative should be coherent, clearly explaining the relationship between the research and the impact, and the nature of the changes or benefits arising (noting that narratives differ according to the areas of impact claimed).
- Indicators used should be relevant, contextualised and precise in support of the case study, and the evidence focused and concise.
- There should be a brief explanation of what is original or distinctive about the research insights that contributed to the impact.
- The case study should include details of the names of researchers, their position in the HEI, and the dates and locations of the research activity.
- Specific and appropriate independent sources of corroborating information should be supplied.
- Where the research was carried out in collaboration with other HEIs, or was part of a wider body of research, this should be acknowledged and the specific input of the submitting unit’s research clearly stated.

Case studies: underpinning research

93. Sub-panels need to be assured that the impact claimed is based on research (at least equivalent to two star, as defined in ‘guidance on submissions’, sub-paragraph 160b). Submitting units are required to identify the underpinning research (which may be a body of work produced over a number of years by one or more individuals, or may be the output or outputs of a particular project).

94. The main panel notes in particular that while the REF is a process for assessing the excellence of research in submitting units, there is a key difference in the assessment of impact: the quality of the underpinning research for an impact case study is a threshold judgement (a level which has to be met in order for a case study to be eligible for assessment), but the quality of the underpinning research will not be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of the reach and significance of the claimed impact.

95. A sample of the underpinning research should be cited that is sufficient to identify clearly the body of work, or individual project that underpins the impact. The onus is on the institution submitting case studies to provide evidence of this quality level. Some of the indicators of such quality might be (but are not restricted to): research outputs which have been through a rigorous peer-review process; end of grant reports referencing a high quality grading; favourable reviews of outputs from authoritative sources; prizes or awards made to individual research outputs cited in the underpinning research; evidence that an output is a reference point for further research beyond the original institution. Not all indicators of quality will apply to all forms of output.

96. Such indicators will allow sub-panels to make an initial assessment as to whether the underpinning research meets the threshold quality criterion to make a case study eligible for assessment. Where the evidence provided is insufficient to confirm that the underpinning research meets the required quality threshold, sub-panels may decide to examine the outputs in more detail. This will be at the discretion of the sub-panel, and submitting HEIs will need to be able to make the outputs (including a portfolio if relevant) available on request.

97. Underpinning research referenced in a case study may also be included in a submission as an output (listed in REF2), without disadvantage. In these situations, the assessment of the impact case study will have no bearing on the assessment of the quality of the output. The assessment of the quality of the output may inform the assessment of the case study, only in terms of assuring the threshold for underpinning research quality.

Impact template

98. General information relating to the impact template is detailed in ‘guidance on submissions’ (paragraphs 149-155), and submitting units should refer to these guidelines in the first instance.

99. The main panel believes that excellent impact can be achieved from within a wide variety of research contexts and resulting from a wide diversity of approaches, and it has no pre-formed view of the ideal context or approach. It will judge each submission on the basis on which it has been presented, as appropriate to the work of the submitted unit and without the expectation that the submission refers to a single, coherent organisational unit.

100. Submitting units should distinguish between collaboration in order to carry out research, which should be explained in the environment template; and
collaboration in order to ensure that research has an impact, which should be explained in the impact template.

101. The sub-panels request the following information in each section. Where possible, relevant illustrative examples with verifiable references should be given rather than broad general statements:

a. **Context**: Who are the main non-academic user groups, beneficiaries or audiences for the research in the submitting unit? What are the main types of impact specifically relevant to the unit’s research? How do these relate to the range of research activity or research groups in the unit?

b. **Approach to impact**: What was the unit’s approach to interacting with non-academic users, beneficiaries or audiences (during the period 2008-2013)? This may include interactions where, for example, the impacts may not have been anticipated when the research was first undertaken; or there was a planned or direct impact; or the subsequent pathways to impact were diffuse and non-linear. Details could include (but are not limited to), for example:
   - How staff in the unit interacted with, engaged with or developed relationships with key users, beneficiaries or audiences to develop impact from the research carried out in the unit (as distinct from research collaborations detailed in the environment template).
   - Evidence of the nature of those relationships and interactions.
   - Evidence of follow-through from these activities to identify resulting impacts.
   - How the unit specifically supported and enabled staff to achieve impact from their research.
   - How the unit made use of institutional facilities, expertise or resources in undertaking these activities.
   - Other mechanisms deployed by the unit to support and enable impact.

c. **Strategy and plans**: What are the goals and plans for the unit to support impact from research in the future? How is the unit developing its strategy for impact?

d. **Relationship to case studies**: How do the selected case studies relate to the unit’s approach to achieving impact, as described in b above? This could include details of, for example, how particular case studies exemplify aspects of the approach, or how particular case studies informed the development of the approach. The main panel recognises that case studies are underpinned by research over a time frame that is longer than the assessment period, and that individual case studies may, therefore, not relate directly to the approach set out in b above.

### Impact criteria

102. The sub-panels will assess impact according to the generic criteria and level definitions in ‘guidance on submissions’, Annex A, Table A3. The criteria will be understood as follows:

- **Reach**: The extent and/or diversity of the organisations, communities and/or individuals who have benefited from the impact.
- **Significance**: The degree to which the impact enriched, influenced, informed or changed the policies, practices, understanding or awareness of organisations, communities or individuals.

103. In assessing the impacts described in case studies, the sub-panels will form an overall view about their reach and significance taken as a whole, rather than assess each criterion separately. While case studies need to demonstrate both reach and significance, the balance between them may vary at all quality levels. The sub-panels will exercise their judgement without privileging or disadvantaging either reach or significance.

104. In considering reach, the potential domain for an impact will be taken into consideration. In other words, reach will be not be assessed in purely geographic terms, nor in terms of absolute numbers of beneficiaries, but rather in terms of the extent to which the potential number or groups of beneficiaries have been affected. The criteria will be applied wherever the impact has been felt, regardless of geography or location, and whether in the UK or abroad.

105. Each of the case studies will be separately assessed against the criteria and quality levels set out for impact, with no greater or lesser rigour being applied than for outputs or environment.
Section D4: Assessment criteria: environment

Environment template

106. The main panel believes that excellent research can be undertaken in a wide variety of research structures and environments, and that the health of the disciplines represented within Main Panel D is well served by that variety. The main panel has no pre-formed view of the ideal size or organisational structure for a research environment, and will judge each submission on the basis on which it has been presented as appropriate to the work of the organisation.

107. In this context, sub-panels will assess the vitality and sustainability of the submitting unit and its contribution to vitality and sustainability of its discipline. Sub-panels recognise that the health of the disciplines requires appropriate infrastructures and activity at HEI level to maintain and develop individuals and groups of researchers, and to train new generations of researchers.

108. Given that there is no expectation that the environment element of submissions relates to a single coherent organisational unit, submissions should explain any distinct groups or units covered, particularly where discrete organisational units form part of a single submission.

109. The following specific information is requested in the five sections of the environment template:

a. Overview: This section should briefly describe the organisation and structure of the submitting unit, to set the context for sub-panels assessing the submission. This section will not be assessed. Note that there is no expectation that this section needs to refer to a single ‘department’ or coherent organisational unit.

b. Research strategy: This section should provide evidence of the achievement of strategic aims for research during the assessment period, and details of future strategic aims and goals for research; how these relate to the structure described in the overview section, and how they will be taken forward. This may include (but is not limited to) evidence of:

- Where relevant, the submitting unit’s position with reference to research plans described in RAE 2008, including reasons for any significant change of direction/strategy or profile.
- The submitting unit’s plans and aspirations for developing its research over the next five years (2014 to 2019), having due regard to sustainability and the wider research context, and including how these plans and aspirations will be realised. This should cover the areas outlined by sections c to e below.

- Support for interdisciplinary and collaborative research (where appropriate).

c. People:

i. Staffing strategy and staff development: This may include (but is not limited to):

- Staff development strategy, for all staff pursuing a career in research (including research assistants and postdoctoral researchers), at all stages of their careers, including the use of mentoring, probation and appraisal and training, and the unit’s implementation of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers.
- Evidence of how individuals at the beginning of their research careers are being supported and integrated into the research culture of the submitting unit, such as through lighter loads for early career researchers.
- The policy for research leave/sabbatical leave, for all staff at all stages of their careers (including fixed-term and part-time staff).
- Clear procedures for career progression of staff at all stages of their careers (including fixed-term staff and part-time staff).
- The contribution of post-doctoral researchers to the unit (where appropriate, the size and type of submitting unit will be taken into account when considering such information).
- Evidence of procedures to stimulate and facilitate exchanges between academia and business, industry or public or third sector bodies, for example, through the recruitment or secondment of research staff.

ii. Research students: This may include (but is not limited to):

- Evidence of the development of a research culture into which research students are
fully integrated and are prepared for further research activity.

- Strong recruitment of doctoral research students and evidence of studentships from major funding bodies (for example, RCUK), although sub-panels recognise the challenges of recruiting doctoral students in the current funding environment.
- Evidence of support for equal opportunities in the recruitment and support of research students.
- Evidence of procedures to stimulate and facilitate exchanges between academia and business, industry or public and third sector bodies, for example, through the recruitment or secondment of research students.
- Details of monitoring and support mechanisms linked to evidence of progress and of successful completions.
- Details of the support provided to research students in terms of skills development and preparation for their future career.

d. **Income, infrastructure and facilities:** This may include (but is not limited to):

- Evidence of the successful generation of research income – although allowance will be made for disciplines that find it more difficult to attract research funding because of the nature of the research, and where more early career researchers are involved. In particular submissions should detail funding that has been received through sources not reported in Higher Education Statistics Agency returns, such as commissions from artistic organisations.
- Scholarly infrastructure supporting research – including significant archives and collections, with a description of their development and use.
- Organisational infrastructure supporting research, for example, evidence of areas where there has been significant investment, or through the development of research clusters that focus on distinctive areas of work.
- Operational infrastructure supporting research within the submitting unit (and, **where relevant**, within the institution more widely) including technical and support staff as well as estate and facilities; advanced equipment; or IT resources.
- The strategy by which an appropriate balance between the scholarly, organisational and operational infrastructures is established, and by which these elements are prioritised and maintained.

e. **Collaboration and contribution to the discipline or research base:** This may include (but is not limited to) collaborative arrangements, partnerships, networks and joint research projects with academic colleagues in other institutions, locally, nationally and internationally, including where these arrangements are interdisciplinary; membership of Research Council or similar national and international committees; involvement on university research advisory panels, or national/international research strategy or review boards; leading positions in professional subject associations and learned societies; editorial positions; examination of doctorates; organisation of conferences and scholarly encounters; refereeing academic publications or research proposals; HEI consultancies; scholarly awards or fellowships; invited keynotes, lectures and/or performances.

Environment data

110. ‘Guidance on submissions’ (Part 3, Section 4) sets out quantitative data relating to the research environment to be included in submissions (REF4a/b/c). Sub-panels will use the data in the context of the information provided in the environment template (REF5) to inform their assessment. Data on research doctoral degrees awarded (REF4a) will be used to inform the sub-panels’ assessment in relation to ‘research students’ (section c.ii). Data on research income (REF4b/c) will be used to inform the sub-panels’ assessment in relation to ‘income, infrastructure and facilities’ (section d).

111. Both doctoral degrees awarded and research income data will be considered in the context of the narrative provided in the REF5 template, and taking account of the size of the submitting unit, its areas of specialism, its research groups, research strategy and different levels of research funding available in different fields.

112. The sub-panels do not require these data to be presented by research group, and this information should not be provided.

Environment criteria

113. The sub-panels will assess the environment according to the generic criteria and level definitions in ‘guidance on submissions’, Annex A, Table A4. The criteria will be understood as follows:

- **Vitality:** The extent to which the research environment supports a research culture characterised by intellectual vigour, innovation and positive contribution within the discipline(s) and profession.
• **Sustainability**: The extent to which the research environment ensures the future health and well-being of the unit and the discipline(s).

114. In assessing the environment element of submissions, sub-panels will apply the criteria in terms of both the research environment within the submitting unit, and its participation in and contribution to the discipline and profession. References to contributions outwith the discipline/profession do not refer to material more properly considered within the impact template, but to research-focused activity.

115. In forming the environment sub-profiles, the sub-panels will attach equal weight to each of the following five components of the environment template, taking account of the environment data as stated in paragraphs 110-111:

- research strategy
- people: staffing strategy and staff development
- people: research students
- income, infrastructure and facilities
- collaboration and contribution to the discipline or research base.